



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,283	07/01/1999	MICHAEL R. FLANNERY	450.202US1	2222

24333 7590 01/22/2003

GATEWAY, INC.
ATTN: SCOTT CHARLES RICHARDSON
610 GATEWAY DRIVE
MAIL DROP Y-04
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

DIAZ, JOSE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/346,283	FLANNERY, MICHAEL R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	José R Diaz	2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS 11/13/2014.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2002 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

➤ The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

➤ Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jie et al. (US Pat. No. 6,133,954).

Regarding claim 1, Jie et al. teach a device comprising a semiconductor support substrate (9) supporting a sensor element (15), a logic circuit (11) and a semiconductor visual display element (10) (see Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 2, Jie et al. teach a semiconductor display element (10') comprising an array of light-emitting pn junctions (see Fig. 2B).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Jie et al. teach a semiconductor display element (10') having dimensions of less than 20 microns (see col. 8, lines 45-46).

Regarding claim 7, Jie et al. teach that the sensor element (15) is selected from the group consisting of strain gauges, thermal gauges, radiation gauges and chemically responsive gauges (see Fig. 1).

➤ Claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wunderman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,122,042).

Regarding claim 1, Wunderman et al. teach a device comprising a semiconductor support substrate (100) supporting a sensor element (114), a logic circuit (104, 106) and a semiconductor visual display element (102) (see Fig. 6A).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Wunderman et al. teach a semiconductor display element (102) comprising an array of GaAs light-emitting pn junctions (see col. 6, lines 56-59 and col. 23, line 14).

Regarding claim 7, Wunderman et al. teach that the sensor element (114) is selected from the group consisting of strain gauges, thermal gauges, radiation gauges and chemically responsive gauges (see Fig. 6A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

➤ The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

➤ Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wunderman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,122,042) in view of Ogihara et al. (US Pat. No. 6,222,208 B1).

Regarding claim 4-6, Wunderman et al. fail to teach that said visual display comprises an of light-emitting pn junctions and/or an array of semiconductor pixels

having a pitch of about 20 μm . Ogihara et al. teach that is well known in the art to use GaAs LEDs as display devices, wherein such GaAs LEDs comprise a pitch of about 20 μm (see col. 1, lines 10-13 and 20-30, and col. 5, lines 12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to modify Wunderman et al. to include GaAs LEDs comprising a pitch of about 20 μm . The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Wunderman et al. in the manner described above for at least the purpose of providing a high precision and bright display.

Response to Arguments

➤ Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José R Diaz whose telephone number is (703) 308-6078. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00 Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 746-3891 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/346,283
Art Unit: 2815

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JRD
January 18, 2003



EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2270